

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 12-CR-95

DANIEL LEE,

Defendant.

ORDER DISMISSING PRO SE MOTION TO SUPPRESS EVIDENCE

On May 31, 2012, the defendant filed a pro se motion to suppress evidence. (Docket # 15.) Although the defendant filed this motion on his own partly because of dissatisfaction with his appointed attorney, dissatisfaction that ultimately led to the court granting counsel's motion to withdraw and new counsel being appointed, the fact remains that the defendant was and shall continue to be represented by counsel in this matter.

When a litigant is represented by counsel, this court does not permit the litigant to also represent himself (i.e. so-called hybrid representation). *United States v. Avery*, 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 38176 (E.D. Wis. Apr. 19, 2010); *see also United States v. Johnson*, 223 F.3d 665, 668 (7th Cir. 2000). Rather, all motions must be filed by counsel rather than the defendant.

Accordingly, the court hereby dismisses the defendant's pro se motion to suppress; the court shall not consider any further matter that comes to the court directly from the defendant. *See United States v. Traeger*, 289 F.3d 461, 471 (7th Cir. 2002); *see also United States v. Turner*, 258 Fed. Appx. 888, 891 (7th Cir. 2007) (unpublished). If the defendant believes that any particular pretrial motion is appropriate, he must discuss the matter with his

appointed attorney and it will ultimately be his attorney's decision as to which, if any, pretrial motions are appropriate.

SO ORDERED.

Dated at Milwaukee, Wisconsin this 6th day of June, 2012.

BY THE COURT

s/Nancy Joseph
NANCY JOSEPH
United States Magistrate Judge